stance by the Communists after being rejected last December, that "it did not recognize voluntary repatriation of prisoners . . . It did not recognize the right of asylum for prisoners of war which applies to political refugees." The attitude and actions of a commission, charged with the fate of the prisoners, in which India holds the casting vote, should be kept under the closest scrutiny.

One marked feature of the Soviet Union since the death of Stalin has been the amazing nose-dive of the deceased dictator in the field of publicity. Only a few months ago no effort was spared in Soviet newspapers and magazines to represent Stalin as the greatest and wisest man who ever lived. He was depicted as a supreme genius not only in war, politics, and economics, but in astronomy, linguistics, philosophy, music, literature, and other subjects too numerous to mention. Only a few months have passed since Stalin died; and the cult of Stalin is in visible decline, if not decay. The tribute to Stalin, the quotations from Stalin have become as rare now as they were frequent and inevitable in the dictator's lifetime. Tyrants, after all, are fragile and brittle creations. The stature of an Abraham Lincoln grows with the generation. The time may well come in Russia when Stalin's memory will be bracketed with that of Ivan the Terrible and recalled with horror and loathing, and some sense of national shame.

Elsewhere in this issue we publish an article by Professor O. Glenn Saxon explaining why it is both necessary and urgent to denationalize electric power. The chief credit for creating an atmosphere in which it is possible to discuss re-privatization, not merely as a remote hope but as a living political issue, must go to former President Herbert Hoover, who spoke out so courageously and convincingly on the subject on April 11. Under the initiative of free men, he pointed out, America developed the technology and use of electricity far beyond any other country. "Stemming from private enterprise, we have created a per capita supply of electrical power for our people three times that of the combined western European nations and eleven times the average of the whole foreign world." In addition, "household electric power is sold today by our private enterprise utilities at one-third of the price of thirty years ago . . . while most other commodities and wages have increased by 50 per cent to 100 per cent. There is no such parallel in any other commodity." Yet despite this amazing record, socialization of electric power has grown today to ominous dimensions. Professor Saxon explains in detail the burdens and losses that this has brought.

At this season of the year, when universities and colleges are discharging their thousands of graduates, some thinking about the design and purpose of American education is not out of place. One of the most important issues in American education is whether state monopoly in this field is desirable. Before he left the presidency of Harvard to assume office as High Commissioner in Germany, Dr. James Bryant Conant declared in favor of the comprehensive public high school system and attacked a dual system of schools as calculated to maintain group cleavages. But Dr. Harold Dodds, President of Princeton, seems to have spoken with more realism when he recently voiced a plea for the maintenance of the independent private school and remarked that too many public schools "play down academic scholarship . . . in favor of universality at a level of intellectual aptitudes adjusted to a common denominator." For a society where many forces work in the direction of mass uniformity, cultural pluralism seems to be the desirable educational ideal.

Few statements in favor of the Bricker amendment have been more persuasive and compact than that of Senator Price Daniel of Texas: "The amendment . . . would prevent any international treaty or agreement from superseding the Constitution as the basic law of the land . . . In the course of recent years, our courts have been unable to reconcile the commitments of certain treaties with the language of the Constitution. On certain occasions, the treaties and agreements have been held to be superior in effect. Furthermore, certain executive actions—notably the seizure of the steel industry by Presidential order—have been predicated upon the authority of treaties as a superior authority to the Constitution. The result is confusion which can be mitigated solely by an affirmative declaration clearly reasserting the superiority of the Constitution in such conflicts. This is necessary for the guidance of the courts, the executive branch, and the legislative branch. More importantly, it is necessary to allay the uncertainty and fear now felt by the American people."

The A.D.A. (Americans for Democratic Action) have been charged by such politically naive persons as Senator Joseph R. McCarthy with fellow-traveling. Until now the *Daily Worker* has not agreed. Few who disagree with the Communist line in the most minute particular get a *Daily Worker* O.K. as bona fide fellow-travelers. In its issue of May 31, however, the *Worker* advised the faithful that the A.D.A. has been added to its Hit Parade. Reporting on the National Convention of the A.D.A. held in Washington the previous week, it O.K.'d all eight hundred delegates, with two exceptions. These were Senator Humphrey and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. It seems they had not toed the line. Schlesinger and Humphrey are special cases. Schlesinger still hopes to write speeches for Adlai Stevenson. Humphrey may have to run against Congressman Walter Judd next year in Minnesota. For them *Daily Worker* approval would be the kiss of death.

No More U. N. Wars

There is no cause for jubilation in the truce that has been arranged, after almost two years of futile bickering, at Panmunjom. The best that the United States, associated, in theory, with the supposed might and majesty of the United Nations, has been able to obtain is a no-decision draw in a struggle with two economically backward Asiatic satellites of the Soviet Union.

The disappointed bitterness with which the news of the truce terms has been received in South Korea, the only country, besides the United States, which has put forth a major war effort, is natural and understandable. Korea has been devastated and physically wrecked by the war. The truce leaves a huge Chinese Communist invading army in occupation of almost the whole of Korea north of the 38th Parallel. It represents a retreat from the position taken by the U. N. Assembly in October 1950, when that body authorized the forces of General MacArthur to drive to the Yalu River and demanded of its members "that all appropriate steps be taken to insure conditions of stability throughout Korea."

The truce hardens and perhaps perpetuates an unnatural, unhistorical, and uneconomic partition of Korea along the arbitrary line of the 38th Parallel. The South Koreans have another well-founded grievance. About 35,000 North Korean prisoners, opposed to Communism, wish to remain in South Korea. The United States proposed that these prisoners be released as soon as an armistice was signed. But under the familiar pattern of pressure from Great Britain, India, Canada, and other U. N. members, this American proposal was discarded, and these Korean prisoners will be transferred to the dubious custody of a five-nation commission, in which Poland, Czechoslovakia, and India constitute a majority.

Everyone hopes that President Eisenhower is correct in asserting that the principle of political asylum for anti-Communist prisoners has been upheld. But India, on the basis of its long record of yielding to every demand of the Chinese Communists, is not, to put it mildly, an ideally qualified custodian of American honor, which is deeply committed to the proposition that no prisoner shall be sent back against his will. And India holds the casting vote in a commission of which the other members are two Communist partisans, Poland and Czechoslovakia, and two honest neutrals, Sweden and Switzerland, which have sent no troops to Korea.

There is no reason to look with much optimism to the political conference which will follow the armistice. The United States will be subjected to the strongest kind of pressure to consent to the admission of Red China to the United Nations. The nations that have done so much to sabotage the conduct of the war with a view to victory may be expected to do everything in their power to lose the peace. The two unanimous votes in the Senate condemning the admission of Communist China should strengthen the hand of the American delegation.

There are several reasons why the United States should stand firm on this issue, if it is not to lose all prestige and influence in the Orient. The Red Chinese regime is a totalitarian tyranny which boasts that it has slaughtered some two million of its own "counter-revolutionary" subjects. It has been waging war for almost three years against the United Nations, trying to shoot its way into the organization. It has been actively supporting the Communist attempt to take over Indo-China. To recognize Red China would be a terrific blow to the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa. Surely at Yalta there was enough of sacrificing faithful friends to appease implacable enemies.

Much in the past and future of the Korean situation is obscure. But one lesson is crystal clear. The United States must never again let itself in for a U. N. war. The very title United Nations has become for some well-meaning Americans a mystical fetish, blinding their eyes to the utter impotence of the United Nations to play any positive role in resisting aggression.

But the Korean record is brutally clear. The position of the United Nations was one of confusion, of divided counsels, of almost grotesque helplessness. It might recall Voltaire's gibe at the Holy Roman Empire, which had ceased to be either holy or Roman or an empire. One of the permanent members of the U. N. Security Council, the Soviet Union, was openly and boastfully supporting a war against the United Nations. It was not even officially censured for this attitude.

Another member of the United Nations, India, a nation of some 300,000,000 inhabitants, contributed nothing to the fight against aggression except an ambulance corps and an infinite amount of defeatist backseat driving, admirably calculated to strengthen Chinese Communist intransigence. If one weighs on one side of the balance the small token contributions which a few U. N. members made in the fighting, and on the other side the immense military and political disadvantages which the United States incurred by subordinating its strategy to the fears and whims of a hopelessly divided organization, there can be little doubt that we would have gained by fighting the war in Korea on our own terms, in alliance with the South Koreans, the Chinese Nationalists, and others who had their hearts in the struggle.